United Nations A/54/833

General Assembly

Distr.: General
6 April 2000
English
Original: Spanish

Fifty-fourth session
Agenda item 67
Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament and non-proliferation agreements

Letter dated 31 March 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to attach herewith a copy of the Declaration of the Consultative and Political Coordination Forum of the Common Market of the Southern Cone (MERCOSUR), Bolivia and Chile, which was adopted in Buenos Aires on 27 March 2000 to mark the thirtieth anniversary of the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The Governments of the member countries of MERCOSUR (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) and the Governments of Bolivia and Chile should be grateful if you would have this Declaration circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 67.

(*Signed*) Arnoldo **Listre**
Permanent Representative
President *pro tempore* of MERCOSUR

00-38029 (E) 060400 060400

Annex

Declaration of the Consultative and Political Coordination Forum of MERCOSUR, Bolivia and Chile, adopted in Buenos Aires on 27 March 2000 to mark the thirtieth anniversary of the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

The date of 5 March last marked the thirtieth anniversary of the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Governments of the member countries of MERCOSUR (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) and the Governments of Bolivia and Chile wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm the importance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an instrument that is the cornerstone of the international system of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

The Governments of MERCOSUR, Bolivia and Chile therefore attach particular importance to the Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which will be convened in New York on 24 April 2000 as a forum to review the implementation of the Treaty, in the light of the decisions adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference.

In the light of recent events that threaten the objectives of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, the Governments of MERCOSUR, Bolivia and Chile attach the greatest importance to universal accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to progress towards the fulfilment of the obligations set out in the Treaty aimed at achieving the goal of a world that is completely free of nuclear weapons. We therefore appeal to those countries that have not yet acceded to the Treaty to do so without conditions and to subscribe to the other instruments of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime so as to fully comply with the obligations that arise thereunder.

Foremost among these obligations is the commitment which the Treaty establishes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to nuclear disarmament and to general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. The Governments of MERCOSUR, Bolivia and Chile therefore urge nuclear-weapon States to unequivocally commit themselves to the complete elimination of their nuclear arsenals at an early date, thereby fully discharging their obligations under article VI of the Treaty.

Article IV of the Treaty also recognizes the inalienable right of all peoples to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In recognition of this right, our Governments shall work to ensure that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Review Conference and other pertinent forums adopt decisions to promote international cooperation in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Latin America is a pioneering region that has long been committed to the cause of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Our countries are part of the first nuclear-weapon-free zone, established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco) in one the most densely populated regions of the globe.

The situation in our subregion has been further strengthened by the Political Declaration signed by the Presidents of the member countries of MERCOSUR, Bolivia and Chile in Ushuaia in July 1998, which declared our countries to be a zone of peace free of weapons of mass destruction.

It is against this background that the Governments of the member countries of MERCOSUR, Bolivia and Chile reaffirm their commitment to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the cornerstone of the international nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime and their determination to make every effort necessary to achieve its full implementation and its universality, as a step towards the ultimate objective of a world free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Buenos Aires, 27 March 2000

United Nations A/54/834–S/2000/295

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
6 April 2000

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session
Agenda item 43
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 6 April 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith an urgent letter addressed to you by General Émile Lahoud, President of the Republic of Lebanon (see annex).

I have the honour to kindly request that this letter be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 43, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Selim **Tadmoury**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-38143 (E) 060400 060400

Annex to the letter dated 6 April 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: Arabic]

President Émile Lahoud conveys his compliments to the Secretary-General, expresses gratitude for his efforts for a just and comprehensive peace in the region and addresses to him the following questions concerning the proposals for a unilateral Israeli withdrawal:

1. What, in your view, are the reasons that in 1978 led the United Nations and the Security Council to adopt resolution 425? Was the Palestinian issue the reason?

2. Why have the United Nations and the Security Council been unable to implement this resolution by way of the forces they have stationed in Lebanon for 22 years? Are you aware of the number of the incursions and the scale of the losses in both human and material terms that Lebanon has suffered since 1978 and up to the present moment as a result of Israel's failure to comply with resolution 425 (1978)?

3. Do you consider that Israel's proposed implementation of resolution 425 (1978) today is:

- In response to the international will and an international endeavour?
- Israel's voluntary contribution to the implementation of the resolution?
- A result of the operations of the Resistance and of Israeli losses?
- To protect the Lebanese people, victims of aggression, or to protect the aggressor?

4. Do you consider that Lebanon has paid dearly for this Israeli retreat? If so, do you find it logical that Lebanon is also being asked to pay the price of protecting this withdrawal and protecting the borders of Israel?

5. Further to question 1 above: if certain Palestinian groups were to attempt to engage in cross-border operations in the context of the right of return and because they have no solutions for their future, do you believe that UNIFIL would be capable of coping with small-scale daily warfare along the borders?

6. As long as there is a possibility of small-scale warfare along the borders fuelled by armed Palestinian groups coming from the Palestinian camps in the interior and in the light of past experiences, most importantly the fact that resolution 425 (1978) stemmed from an Israeli incursion that had Palestinian causes, do you not believe that Lebanon's interest requires that UNIFIL should first and foremost disarm the Palestinian camps, or participate on the ground in doing so, whether in Tyre, Sidon, Tripoli, Beirut, Baalbek or elsewhere, before they deploy along the borders? Does the United Nations accept as a Lebanese condition that such a deployment along the borders should not be allowed before the Palestinians are disarmed, given that the interior is linked with the border zone and that UNIFIL, according to resolution 425 (1978), has the purpose of "restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area" (the south and the Western Bekaa)? Is it possible to restore this authority without disarming the Palestinians?

7. Whether or not there is such disarmament, what are the United Nations guarantees that Israel will not violate Lebanon's land borders, maritime boundaries and airspace or engage in adventitious attacks in the South and in the interior? What guarantees are there to prevent a recurrence of what has happened previously in the presence of UNIFIL, which has been stationed in the South since 1978? Will the proposed international force have means of deterrence on land, at sea and in the air in order to enforce these guarantees? Who will order such a force to implement the guarantees in the event of a breach or of attacks?

8. In the United Nations archives for 1978, there is evidence that on 31 July 1978 the Lebanese Government sent forces from the Lebanese Army to the South to enforce resolution 425 (1978) at the request of the United Nations and that the Israeli forces and their proxies forcibly intercepted the Lebanese Army at the town of Kawkaba, bombarded it and prevented it from advancing, leaving a number of dead and wounded among its ranks. Since that time, Israel has carried out successive incursions that have cost Lebanon thousands of dead and wounded and material and other losses in excess of $70 billion. Today, Israel says that it is about to implement resolution 425 (1978) out of respect for the international community, while everyone knows that it is doing so as a result of its losses and because of the Resistance. The question is: faced with this situation, who decided to exempt Israel from the reparations due to Lebanon and its people as a result of its intransigence and its constant hostility to this resolution up to the present time? On what basis was this forgiveness given? Does the aggressor, in the view of the United Nations, have the right to get away scot-free? Furthermore, is the aggressor entitled to seek protection from the victim of its aggression?

These are questions to which Lebanon seeks answers from the United Nations before deciding to venture into other details.

In the meantime, Lebanon is committed to a just and comprehensive peace that provides guarantees to all while it is of the view that any Israeli withdrawal under pressure from the Resistance is a major victory for Lebanon and for resolution 425 (1978) itself. It is a victory on which it is difficult to bargain in the absence of the clarifications sought and given the customary Israeli manoeuvring.

(*Signed*) Émile **Lahoud**
President of the Lebanese Republic